

PATENT
USA.302

The Action is submitted as being entirely improper for ignoring specific limitations in independent Claim 1 and independent Claim 16. Specifically, independent Claim 16 expressly recites that an oil based component permeates a three-dimensional object when in contact with the three-dimensional object at a temperature above glass transition temperature of the polymer component, and that it includes an infiltration agent dispersed in the oil-based component that penetrates the three-dimensional object during processing. Independent Claim 1 from the Group I method claim expressly recites, "the fluid medium carrying an infiltration agent and permeating the three-dimensional object at a temperature above the glass transition temperature of the polymer component." The Claim 1 limitations further recite that the application of the fluid medium to the three-dimensional object is maintained to "allow the infiltration agent to penetrate the three-dimensional object." This language expressly excludes a mere surface coating, as the restriction requirement posits is the way in which the composition of Group II can be used in a materially different process than that claimed in Group I.

Hence, Applicants submit that in view of the express limitations present in both the method and the composition claims requiring there be permeation of the three-dimensional object and an infiltration agent to permit the penetration of the three-dimensional object, that the restriction requirement is improper and should be withdrawn. Withdrawal of the restriction requirement and examination of the independent claims that are linked by the generic features of requiring permeation and an infiltration agent are respectfully requested. Applicants submit that independent Claims 1 and 16 and their dependent claims are not independent and distinct inventions and are properly presented in the same Application for the reasons recited above.

A 2. In order to ensure that the Application is not abandoned for not being responsive to the pending Office Action, and solely for that reason, in the event that this preliminary traversal is not deemed persuasive, Applicants elect Claims 1-15 for prosecution and provisionally cancel Claims 16-23. However, as Applicants have stated above, Applicants are strongly opposed to the propriety of restriction requirement in view of the express limitations present in both independent claims.

3. The Office is advised that all future correspondence in the case should be directed to the undersigned as Mr. Curry is no longer an employee of 3D Systems, Inc. The undersigned can be reached at the number listed below.

MAR-31-2003 14:30

3D SYSTEMS

661 257 4953 P.04/04

PATENT
USA.302

Pursuant to currently recommended Patent Office practice, the Examiner is expressly authorized to call the Applicant's attorney collect at Valencia, California, if in his judgment disposition of this application could be expedited or if he considers the application not ready for examination or final disposition by other than allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
3D Systems, Inc.



Ralph D'Alessandro
Reg. No. 28,838
Attorney for Applicants

Dated: March 31, 2003

26081 Avenue Hall
Valencia, CA 91355
(661) 295-5600, ext. 2404

FAX RECEIVED
APR 01 2003
GROUP 1700